Louisiana Law Review

Volume 28 | Number 3
The Work of the Louisiana Appellate Courts for the 1966-1967 Term: A Symposium
April 1968

Public Law: Corporations

Leila Obier Cutshaw

pay was received, the employees were not deprived of wages or its equivalent.[5]

Another novel question was presented in *Cotright v. Doyal*[6] where the claimant gave her employer notice that she was leaving employment as a salad girl to move to California but three days later told him she was not leaving because of the illness of a relative. The employer had already hired a replacement. With no precedent in Louisiana, the court reviewed the cases elsewhere and took the liberal position that "by retracting her notice of leaving, . . . and remaining available and desiring to continue her employment we opine that her status was as one who did not voluntarily become unemployed, or stated somewhat differently, she never *left* her job until so directed by her employer."[7] As remedial legislation, the Employment Security Act should be interpreted so as to extend its benefits as far as possible within bounds imposed by the expressed legislative restrictions.[8] This the court did in the instant case, determining that economic security for the employee who had not voluntarily abandoned her employment was, on balance, in the public interest.

CORPORATIONS

*Leila Obier Cutshaw**

Statutes restricting the inspection of corporate books and records represent an attempt to balance the right of the individual shareholder as part owner of the corporation to inspect the books against the rights of other shareholders that information gleaned from them will not be used to the detriment of the corporation. In qualifying this right to information so as to protect the corporation and other shareholders, the Louisiana Business Corporation Act requires both a specified duration of shareholding and a specified percentage of share ownership for exercise of the inspection right.[1] Inspection rights are usually

5. In an earlier case, George v. Brown, 144 So.2d 140 (La. App. 4th Cir. 1962), the Fourth Circuit held that termination pay received by a claimant, equal to 17 weeks pay, did not constitute wages, so that the claimant was eligible for benefits. Perhaps the distinguishing feature of the two is that on receipt of termination pay the employee is free to seek other employment.

6. 195 So.2d 176 (La. App. 2d Cir. 1967).

7. *Id.* at 179.

8. Jackson v. Administrator of Division of Employment Sec. of Dept. of Labor, 128 So.2d 915 (La. App. 2d Cir. 1961).

* Research Associate, Louisiana State University. Mrs. Cutshaw served as research assistant to the Committee on Revision of Louisiana Corporation Laws of the Louisiana State Bar Association for twenty months.

1. LA. R.S. 12:38 (1950). Louisiana is one of three states requiring both

exercised at the registered office or the principal place of business of the corporation. In *Brandt Glass Co. v. New Orleans Housing Mart, Inc.*[2] the court of appeal determined, for the first time here or elsewhere, that the *place* where the inspection occurs might be at other than these two.

In *Brandt* a minority stockholder brought a mandamus proceeding to force the defendant to deliver certain books and records to the office of plaintiff's attorney for inspection and copying on a Xerox machine there. The trial court ordered the corporation to comply, and the court of appeal affirmed, cautioning that its holding was narrowly confined to the facts of the case. "Our corporation statutes being silent on the place of inspection, it is our opinion that the place of inspection is not restricted as a *matter of law* to the offices of the corporation, but that a Trial Court has discretion to order it held elsewhere just as it has discretion to fix the time of inspection and other incidents connected therewith. But for many obvious reasons the inspection should ordinarily be ordered to be held at the place where the records are kept, that is, at the registered or principal office of the corporation, and ordinarily it would amount to an abuse of discretion to order the inspection held elsewhere. Our remarks are confined to domestic corporations having their principal offices within the territorial jurisdiction of the court."[3]

The last quoted remark of the court in *Brandt* may refer to two cases from other jurisdictions which dealt with the request for transfer of the books from the New York office, which was the principal place of business of the corporation, to the registered office in the state of incorporation for inspection there.[4] The request was refused in both cases, with the court commenting in one: "The problem is essentially one of the relative convenience of all parties concerned."[5]

With the advent of bulky duplicating equipment and the arrival of even bulkier records, it was only a question of time before the issue here presented was raised. It is to the court's credit that the question was resolved in an eminently practical fashion.

---

a period of holding and a percentage of ownership. Maryland and Michigan are the other two.

2. 193 So.2d 321 (La. App. 4th Cir. 1966).

3. *Id.* at 324.

4. Ruby v. Penn Fibre Board Corp., 326 Pa. 582, 192 A. 914 (1937); Cornell v. Nestle Le Mur Co., 65 Ohio App. 1, 29 N.E. 2d 162 (1940).

5. Ruby v. Penn Fibre Board Corp., 326 Pa. 582, 192 A. 914, 916 (1937).